SHRI SHANKARRAO NARAYANRAO DESHMUKH: Sir, a survey was made last year and an answer was given to me through a letter that a survey was made. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister who conducted this survey, who collected the data and is therj any correspondence going on between the State of Maharashtra and the Government of lndia.

SHRI AJIT PANJA; As I said, the quesiou of survey did not arise, and there is no survey done so far as the region mentioned by the Hon. Member is concerned.

SHRI SHANKARRAO NARAYANRAO DESHMUKH; I have received answer in reply to my letter addressed to the previous Minister for Information & Broadcasting that a survey was made and it was not feasible. Is this true or not?

SHRI AJIT PANJA: As I said, Sir, a survey of Maharashtra coverage was of course made but the question was of the particular hill, Ankai; at the time when this survey was madregion-wise and the time when this survey was made is during the Sixth Plan. At that time the parameters were that (owns with one lakh [a]nd more pMiration would be covered. But here population mentioned, is 51, 432 of thc'place mentioned, i. e. Ankai region. Therefore, it was not brought in.

Will you please try for that?

SHRI AJIT PANJA; If the letter is produced I will certainly look into it.

डा० बापू कालदाते : सभापति महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि जिस पत्र का आपने जिक्र किया है माननीय सदस्य ने, अब इस पत्र के बारे में आप जरा खोज कर सकेंगे क्या ? अगर खोज कर सकेंगे तो शायद उनके पत्र पर जवाब जो उनको मिला है, उसका आप ठीक से जवाब दे सकेंगे ।

SHRI SHANKARRAO NARAYANRAO DESHMUKH: I will produce the letter, Sir.

Disparity in payment of bonus in the Corps of EME

*445. DR. H. P. SHARMA; Vill the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some civilian staff in the Corps of EME are being deprived of the benefits of productivity-linked bonus in comparison to their counter-parts in the same department;

(b) if so, what are the reasons therefor;

(c) what is the number of such staff who have been adversely affected;

(d) whether it is also a fact that the affected employees have been representing against this dual policy since- 1979 but Government have not taken any decision in the matter so far; and

(e) if so, what steps Government propose to take to remove the disparity?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI ARUN SINGH): (a) to (d) In the Corps of EME 18, 406 civilian employees, fulfilling the criteria laid down by the Government, have been receiving payment of Productivity Linked Bonus since the inception of the Scheme. 548 civilian employees of this Corps involved in production, are not covered by the scheme, as *inter-alia* the units in which they are deployed have a majority of combatant personnel. The aforesaid 548 civilian employees 'have been receiving ad-hoc bonus since 1982-83.

(e) The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

DR. H. P. SHARMA: Mr. Chairman, quite a few problems arise in institutions where combatants and civilians both are-doing the same kind of work, because same emoluments are not given to both categories of workers. The reply admits that there are 548 employees which are not covered by productivity-linked bonus. May I know the reason way they are being given only ad hoc bonus and they are being differentiated from other employees?

SHRI ARUN SINGH; One of the coa-ons of productivity-linked bonus scheme, in so far as Defence is concerned, is that employees in the organisation should be predominantly civilian. As per this criterion, eight base workshops would only be covered under the sche-ir. 3. There were other civilian employees in station workshop, vehicle dopot workshop, equipment depot workshop, and

on, who would have been left out. We found on a computation that the total

ober of civilian employees in such HKJls exceeded the total number of combatant employees and, therefore, finally 78 EME units were covered under the scheme. There are now 11 units jeft where this criterion cannot apply because the number of combatants exceeds the number of non-combatants. Therefore, as per the basis of the scheme itself, 548 employees at the moment do not stand covered by the scheme.

DR. H. P. SHARMA: Who decides about this criterion and do both the sides agree to this criterion which the Minister has placed before the House? Second part of my question is, does the Government propose to constitute any kind of an agency which will go through all such institutions where civilians and combatants work and if there are any disparities, will it go through? Is there any overall agency which the Government propose to constitute?

SHRI ARUN SINGH: I am not clear about the Member referring to both sides in the matter...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is, cobatants and civilians.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: There is no discussion between the combatants and non-combatants in the matter. This criterion was Part of the original productivity-linked bonus scheme, which was introduced in 1979-80. As far as overall committee is concerned, I am happy to inform the hon. Member that there is an inter-Ministerial committee at the moment sitting and considering this matter because this affects a large number of employees in all kinds of Ministries, including ours, and there are representatives of our Ministry also. The committee i_s chaired by Joint Secretary (Personnel) in the Department of Expenditure and their report is awited. This matter is, in fact, before the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN; Next question.

Central Advisory Committee for Territorial Army

*446. SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY; Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state;

(a) whether the Central Advisory Committee for the Territorial Army has been constituted; if so. when the last meeting wa_s held, the frequency of its meetings and the proposed date for the next meeting; and

(b) if the answer to part (a) above be in the negative, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI ARUN SINGH): (a) Yes, Sir. The last meeting of the Committee was held on 23rd March. 1984. The Committee have generally been meeting once in two years The next meeting of the Committee wi be held by the end of this year.

(b) Does not arise.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDD[7]'
In the answer, it has been said that t committee will meet generally once in years and the last meeting was hold March 1984 and the next meeting is p posed to be held by the end of t month. I would like to know, aire; two years and 9 months have passed, do not know why there is this dela inaction in having the meeting. Tf members are not interested in the *n* ing, I think they should eithei resign they must have a new committee so the committee must become active there should be no delay and letharg I want to know what action is ' taken and why this delay has taken j